

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 25, 2003 (Paper No. 17). Claims 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 19, 20 and 22 to 25 are in the application, of which Claims 8, 19 and 20 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 16, 19 and 20 were objected to for allegedly not being in proper independent format. In response, Claims 19 and 20 have been amended to remove all dependencies on other claims, and Claim 16 has been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and without conceding the correctness of the objection. As such, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

All claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite and incomplete. Specifically, the Office Action alleged that there are no limitations recited to obtain a laser oscillating apparatus, and that, in Claims 1, 16 and 17, it is not clear as to how the plasma is generated. As shown above, Claims 1 to 7, 10, 12, 14, 16 to 18 and 21 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and without conceding the correctness of this rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the remaining claims are respectfully requested, in view of the amendments to these claims that emphasize how laser oscillation is obtained.

No other matters being raised, it is believed the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,  
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to  
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 50,325

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
CA\_MAIN 65745 v 1